

Twice today, I have received advertisements from “Jinnie Store”, ads which are quite misleading in nature and may qualify in fact as a bait-and-switch scam. I posted a comment alerting the vendor to the fact that the product in the video they show did not match the product listed on the web page, and I also found the web page, which I understand is not under the purview of Facebook) posts a stream of fictitious names of customers in my area who have recently purchased the same issue, going back minutes up to six hours from what I could see (placing many of these sales at 4 AM MST local time, which is quite dubious given a town of our size, 35,000 or so residents).

But in addition to the vendor making misleading ads, there is also a broader issue of the mechanism of reporting serious issues such as I believe this to be difficult. Facebook only provides the means of providing feedback that an ad may be misleading, without providing users such as myself documenting their reasoning or providing screenshots, PDFs, etc, which may help determine the veracity of claims, or possibly documenting illegal activities.

Having a simple “misleading advertising” feedback is insufficient to document •why• an ad may be misleading, as the issues may be quite subtle as is the case here.

REGARDING THE PRACTICES OF THE JINNIE STORE

Returning to what I am saying about the Jinnie store, my reasoning for this being misleading advertising or a scam are as follows, and I will refer to the “20190424_Jinnie_Store_possible_bait_and_switch_scam.zip” file which I am providing here, and will also be posting to the Internet Archive to document this issue.

1) The Jinnie Store was founded only very recently, March 10, 2019, and appears to be based out of Vietnam, and it should be noted is not under the jurisdiction of any US laws.

2) The video shows a six-sided solar-powered electric motor which levitates above a bed which contains fixed magnets to achieve the levitation. However, this does not match the product shown through the bit.ly abbreviated URL below, which redirects to a dScarf product which is four-sided and completely different looking.

[abbreviated URL]

<<https://bit.ly/2v9wBti>>

[redirected URL, including embedded FB tags]

<<https://bit.ly/2v9wBti?fbclid=IwAR0-YapCpmHBc6adz6s7Fu7KYFTJeSXG7pe8IDbQIZIX6Ib9BvAVov-46X8>>

3) My comment below, giving the vendor the benefit of the

doubt that the incorrect product was listed, was deleted without comment within 90 hours of my posting the comment.

“An interesting device and I was going to share this ad with my followers on @ScienceVsUniverse, but then I noticed the shortened link actually links to a different product, the “dScarf™ – Solar Motor” linked to below. Fix the link and I might consider sharing this, otherwise too sketchy. Possibly just a slip-up, but possibly also a case of bait and switch; giving the vendor the benefit of the doubt.”

4) As I mentioned, when you follow the bit.ly URL, which will then put you on a dScarf web page with a FB tag which may indicate your location, in addition to the product not matching what is advertised, there is also a stream of “recent customers” presented, none of which appear to live in the Prescott, Arizona area from what I can tell (the first person matched the name of a Facebook user in Austin, Texas). Furthermore, since I encountered the ad shortly after 10 AM MST this morning, many of the sales reported had occurred at about 4 AM MST in large volumes, highly doubtful for a town this size. Even if the sales •were• to be accurate, what company releases the identify of recent customers? That in and of itself suggests this to have been a scam.

The attached ZIP file contains four screenshots of claimed sales which appear to be quite bogus as there is no

indication that the named parties, which have strange names to say the least, are residents of Prescott, Arizona.

5) When the ad appeared again in my News Feed, I noticed that my prior comment about the product mismatch had been quietly deleted. I posted another comment in stronger (yet polite) words. I did not capture an Embed of the link to the ad (or rather, I did, but then accidentally lost it in my Clipboard with another text cut/copy operation), so I do not know if my second comment has stuck.

REGARDING FACEBOOK CONSUMER REPORTING POLICIES

I just received word that my anonymous report of this misleading ad is being reviewed by Facebook. While that's great, please note that so far aside from simply flagging the vendor, the •nature• of how this ad is misleading has not been possible, except through this "Report a Problem" to indicate that in addition to the ad being problematic, Facebook is not providing a reasonable pathway to providing feedback/documentation about the problem.

By providing such limited feedback by consumers about misleading ads, Facebook may, in fact, be enabling sketchy vendors and advertisers who may be able to duck

under the radar of such a review. I shall be providing this problem report as a 'mildly unhappy response' to the "How was this experience?" feedback query, but there, unlike here, I know I will be unable to provide my documentation as I am doing here.

My ZIP file includes documentation of the limitations of the "Report This Ad" feedback method, in the "Facebook Issues" subfolder. I will describe them below.

1) I gave the vendor the benefit of the doubt by providing a comment. I •should• have also saved an Embed of the advertisement later, but I did not think to do that. So when I realized a bit later that this was looking indeed like a scam, my only recourse was to report the Page, not the ad, since I did not save a breadcrumb to the original ad, and it had crolled off my News Feed and was then invisible to me. I also couldn't locate my comment on the two ads listed in the "Jinnie Store > Info and Ads" tab of their page — note that even though I •submitted• a comment, I cannot check to see if it is there or if it has been deleted by the vendor.

In reporting the page, there is an option "Scams and Fake Pages" for "Give feedback on this Page" [screenshot 1) under "Facebook Issues" in the ZIP file] However, the topics below are too specific, and do not provide a "Misleading advertising" or "Dubious business practices" section or even an "Other" section where you can spell out

the issues. So reporting the Page was blocked, and by this point I didn't have the ability to reference the specific ad (I guess through "Info and Ads" I could have reported one or both of the ads).

2) The closest I could figure to provide feedback was to report the Page and use the "Poor Purchase Experience" category which is not correct as I never purchased anything) and then indicate "Not As Advertised" since indeed the product in the video clearly does not match the product on the dCraft page [screenshot 2)]. Furthermore, after pressing Send my report, there was no ability to provide the information I am providing here to document my reasoning, which is subtle [screenshot 3)].

3) Fortunately, the ad appeared on my News Feed again shortly after noon MST and I was able to provide a direct complaint indicating that the ad was misleading or a scam (see screenshot 4)]. However, here again, without this "Report a Problem" to indicate the fundamental limitations of how folks can document such cases, or the "mildly unhappy face" on the review of the ad currently underway, there is still only limited opportunity where Facebook users can supply reasoning and documentation for why they flag an ad or Facebook page.

I view this as a fundamental limitation of Facebook which may enable vendors and scammers to keep predatory ads online, and something that Facebook should seriously

review and consider changing.

NOTE: Since I am unable to provide supporting documentation of the issues I am citing via ZIP file, since they must include PDF and TXT files, and not just screenshots which Facebook is limiting these too, I provide a link to where you can find the detailed ZIP file providing documentation not only about my issues with the Jinnie Store ad and page but also about my complaints about the limited or non-existent means Facebook is providing to document serious transgressors of Facebook policies or US law. I am considering providing this documentation about Facebook's limitations to the Federal Trade Commission for their review, as I find Facebook's support for Facebook's consumer reporting to be beyond subpar, but potentially complicit in enabling predatory vendors to do business through Facebook.

Feel free to contact me through this problem report, or any of the means indicated below.

Humbly submitted,

Bert Sierra
The Kanamit Collective
916 Forest Hylands Rd
Prescott, AZ 86303-4642
(928) 458-5809 [no TXTs]

bert.sierra@me.com
bertsierra@gmail.com
@bert.sierra on FB